

(4)

All participants (applicant	annlicant's representative	PTO nerconnel

(1) <u>LONGBIT CHAI</u>. (3)_____

(2) Jay Q. Knobloch

Date of Interview: 08 July 2009.

Type: a)☑ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: 2004/0260782 and 2005/0055709.

Agreement with respect to the claims fi⊠ was reached. a) □ was not reached. h) □ N/A.

Substance of Interview inclusing description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments. Discussed with attorney to place the application in condition of allowance. Examiner requested to amend the claims I and 91% cared claim 51 and worked with Applicant to reach a common agreement to present a proposal of claim amendments for allowance. Applicant authorized Examiner for Examiner's amendment to soutide the prosequicity.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLIDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 73.04,) if an epy to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DAYS FROM THE CONTROL OF THE MAIN DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DAYS FROM THE CHIEF T

/Longbit Chai/		